MARRIAGE

HQ46
M55M2
1906

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

GIFT OF

PROFESSOR
GEORGE R. STEWART

35

MARRIAGE

BY

JANE DEARBORN MILLS
(MRS. JAMES E. MILLS)

AUTHOR OF "LEAVES FROM A LIFE-BOOK OF TO-DAY" AND
"THE MOTHER ARTIST"

SECOND EDITION

PHILADELPHIA:
THE NUNC LICET PRESS
1906

COPYRIGHT, 1905, BY
THE NUNC LICET PRESS

WM. F. FELL CO., ELECTROTYPERS AND PRINTERS
1220 TO 1224 SANSOM STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DEDICATED TO

THE MEMORY OF MY HUSBAND

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/marriage00millrich

Prelude.

These words upon Marriage are such as only a woman could speak. The "Purity" word is in answer to the numerous public teachings of many other women in their advocacy of the "doctrine of sexlessness." A man's opinions have little weight against their reasoning.

The other three "Words" also, are thoughts from the woman's standpoint. There is no human interest so necessary to be presented by both the man's and the woman's mind as marriage, for none concerns them both so vitally.

This answers the question in advance, which will be asked, "Why does a woman write about Marriage?" The present writer knows that, already, the first imperfect edition of this book, privately published and circulated with moderate publicity, has cheered some of the lives in homes of our land. This has led to the

request for the renewal of the exhausted edition, and she has wholly rewritten and added to it, believing that it probably has a further work to do.

Marriage is character-growth
and is gained through service.

MARRIAGE.

ITS PURITY.

IN these, our modern days, one of the evils which thoughtful minds are seeking to destroy is sexual vice. Many men and women are devoting all their powers to the eradicating of one form or another of this deadly enemy of the race. Especially is the corrupting of the children a hydraheaded monster, eluding every effort to kill all of him at once. Mothers, fathers, teachers, and other lovers of the little ones are giving study, time, money, and devotion to finding ways for keeping children from impure thoughts and acts. With equal earnestness they work for the uprooting of this evil in adult living.

The adult form is twofold,—that outside of marriage and that within its legal limits. The latter has expression in the bestiality of some

husbands, but it has not been regarded as an evil until very recent times. The base of all the forms is the same. It consists, primarily, in the thought that the physical marriage is essentially impure. Therefore, all married people have been supposed to live in sensuality, tolerable only by permission of the law, or sanctified by a church ceremonial. Naturally, the young and uneducated have been unable to see the difference between sex-relations outside the marriage and within it, and have easily fallen into the evil.

The cause of the degrading notion that marriage is mere legalized sensuality is that its spiritual power is not known. The greatest value of any action, whatsoever, is in its spiritual, not its physical, effects. We may see this in very simple things. Looking from my window on this bright winter morning, the purity of the snow upon the lawn fills me with delight, and, still more, that here and there the sun makes little jewels of the crystals, and a clear, brilliant and most exquisite ruby color comes to my eye as a pre-

cious stone lying in the whiteness; and there is another, equally brilliant, but paler; and there an emerald, and there a topaz. My eye feasts on this wonderful display, and I discover more and more, until, for a considerable space around, there lies before me a collection of the rarest gems. No jeweler's tray of precious stones could be their equal in clearness, brilliancy, delicacy, and warmth of color. The mere sight, however, is the smallest part of this experience. What is of lasting value in it is the new sense of beauty it has given me. I have never seen before, in colored snow crystals, such numbers, largeness, brilliancy, exquisiteness. This sense of beauty will be mine forever. An added power, it will go forth, if there is any love of service in me, in many ways, most of them unconscious, for good in my intercourse with fellow-beings. As every child opens a larger association with the world for father and for mother, so each such mental and spiritual power as this new sense of beauty leads the way out into greater service to humanity.

Thus, every kind of action has its value in its spiritual results. This is a mode of our spiritual growth. Our acts are openers of the way by which Divine Life flows down through the character, even to the outmost of us, and goes forth into the world.

The spiritual powers created by any act are its results, more than the physical; for the latter pass out of our possession, but the others belong to us always. Already, as I write, the sun has shifted, and my snow jewels are gone. The sense of their beauty stays with me and is mine forever.

Wanting this principle, the physical union has been held by the world to have no purity inherent in itself, but allowed only as a concession to human nature as it is found to be. This has resulted in extreme evils within the limits of marriage. Many a husband has lived like a brute, subjecting the one he loved most dearly to the unspeakable torture of his tyranny. Why should he not? If marriage is an unavoidable concession to human weakness, then must that weakness have its way,

at any cost whatever to the wife, in suffering, sickness, and even death.

In desperate revolt against the impurity and misery of these conditions, pure-minded women have been looking for a remedy. The one naturally suggesting itself first has been that physical union must have been intended only for physical procreation; and this has become so widely advocated in private and in public, that it has now obtained something of a following.

Those accepting this alternative have done so from not yet seeing the truth just spoken of,—that the real effects of any act are spiritual. By this law, the physical union becomes of spiritual value, when entered into in mutual love and willingness. The feelings and the thoughts then wakened in the souls of husband and wife are the real children of the marriage more than all the child human beings born to them. Human beings are not sons and daughters in any lasting sense. As soon as they are born, they begin to grow as separate individuals. In a few years, their relation to

their parents changes to that of companions; of very dear companions, to be sure, but with nothing in it of the child dependence, and the mother and father guidance. They do not even go forth into the world to do the will of father or of mother, but their own. Generally, their powers for the world's welfare bear slight resemblance to those of the parents. This separation, so sorrowful to the natural affections, is not the calamity it is supposed to be; for the lasting relation of Life is that of marriage, with its spiritual, not its physical, children.

The idea that marriage in externals is wholly for procreation is literally true; but it is for spiritual procreation, preëminently, and this may or may not coincide with the birth of children. It cannot depend upon such birth; for where the union is permitted only at the few times when children are expected, it is practically banished from the married life. The theory of union for mere physical procreation has grave defects and deficiencies. It surrounds with an atmosphere of filth the

thought of the birth of all the innocent babies who have come into life from the usual habit of living of husband and wife. It supposes the world to have been immersed for ages in a state so vile, that if this had been really the character of marriage, the race, if not by this time annihilated, would be a monster of unmixed evil.

Another defect is in the necessity it involves of a certain kind of separation of the husband and wife. Every real mother understands how her nearness to her child is increased, marvellously, by her custom of being with him when he is ready for sleep. The childish imperfections are, for the moment, laid aside, and only the softer affections control the little spirit. She realizes that there is a value, for them both, not to be gained at any other time, in those few minutes, before she leaves him to go to sleep peacefully by himself. Such affections as awaken then could never be called up in daytime hours. Similar states of innocence and peace may come to husband and wife in those moments when they feel

themselves "alone with God and the angels"; when the day's cares and perplexities may be driven away, and trust and restfulness in the Divine be welcomed by them. Many of the mutual annoyances, the frictions which arise from small or the graver offences, may disappear without the aid of formal explanations, in those times of utter rest of mind and body. A mutual understanding follows of each other's deeper character, in this quiet communion. This not only soothes for the moment, but is of lasting value as a more generous interpreter of imperfections in the future. Such peace, in its real depths, cannot be theirs at any other hour, and those who practice the doctrine of sexlessness lose largely, if not altogether, the deeper forms of it.

In contrast to this sexless theory is the ideal of the essential purity of marriage. The object of marriage is the growing into one of all the best in the husband and the wife, the growing of each, constantly, toward his or her highest possibilities. The aim for the "oneness" is that it shall be a power for

stimulating the highest possibilities of the race. This married "one" has energies and forces far greater than those which the same man and woman, singly, could possess; for it not only is a form of all the best in his nature and in hers, but it is these qualities in united action.

It is impossible for words to picture the happiness of such reciprocal giving of the individual selves. In a marriage like this, each delights to feed the angel in the character of the other, starving out the self-love by not administering to it; and to the end that the "one" angel of their united selves may be an added power for the world's uplifting.

Such mutual love excludes no kind of outer life in its expression. Love seeks, by its very nature, all possible modes of manifestation. It cannot, without crippling itself, leave out of life its own peculiar language,—caresses. The mother who exhausts her love for her child in sewing for him, cooking for him, or in providing others to do these well, and in

carefully studying the best methods for his education, and never gives him an endearing word or a caress, is leaving out the essential of his education, thus stunting all his powers, and putting his affections to indescribable torture. Caresses are the especial language of love. They say what words cannot. The warm hand-grasp of a friend, the kiss or the embrace, when heartfelt, are assurances of continued affection, such as no words can convey. To the husband and wife who value marriage oneness,—and many do who are unconscious of it,—caresses are infinitely more than mere assurances. Words can never say that which every kiss of marriage mutually tells to them. It is a pledge of continued faithfulness in their united purpose, a plea for overlooking all shortcomings, a wordless longing for a closer union. It means mutual understanding, honor, love, desire for higher living, and, above all, the aspiration to give and to receive the strength for that higher life, which they have been created to bestow upon each other. So it speaks with its own strong

language, and revivifies all their spiritual powers, and creates new ones.

Infinitely stronger than the kiss in spiritual procreative power is that nearer union, which, though deprived of its true name by the common degradation of thought about it, is, when entered into in purity, a caress more than any other. When this is given and received by each with the purpose of mutual growing in all the deepest and strongest possibilities of their characters, it is the purest spiritual influence, and the most powerful, which they can bring mutually into their lives.

The theory of sexlessness has, in part, grown out of a desire to provide for unhealthy conditions. There are wives who are disabled, physically, for normal marriage; also those for whom poverty makes the bringing of children into the world a doubtful wisdom. These conditions are abnormalities. Physical disabilities are individual disorders; poverty is a race crime. They must have special

treatment, case by case, until they can be done away with. The methods for meeting them are not the laws of normal living. Those who have advocated the doctrine of sexlessness have called them so. A moment's thought will show what a mistake this is: Sick people often have to stay in bed; poor people, to go hungry; it does not follow that the way for everybody to live is to stay in bed and starve.

If women, generally, recognized the spiritual effect upon the character of the external union of marriage, there would be fewer invalids among wives. They would realize that the highest use they could do for humanity would be to cherish the spiritual power of their marriage, and they would avoid ill-health as they seldom do now. Very much of sickness comes to women from undue reaching after what the world can give to them and their children; or, sometimes, from false notions of the necessity of sacrificing themselves to the demands of relatives and friends; or to "do good" to strangers; or, from over-attention to the husband's artificial wants. Men

often desire their wives to keep up a style of living, and of dressing, for themselves and children, which they, the husbands, affect to despise. They often have a selfish ambition that their wives should excel others in what is called "good housekeeping," or they often require a table so elaborate that it overtaxes a wife to see that it is always up to the standard. If wives could see the value to their spiritual marriage, and of how much stronger and finer quality all their "doing good" of every kind would be in health than in sickness, many of them would soon be able to make their husbands understand the wrong of exactions which overtax the strength of the homemaker. This also would be a power for turning from brutality in their intimate relations those many husbands who are more thoughtlessly than wickedly selfish, and leading them toward reasonableness and self-control. For cherishing the spiritual power of any affection lessens the craving for its abnormal expression. The effect of new-created soul-energy is to open a greater variety of ways for the expenditure

of all energy, and this tends to decrease unhealthy inclinations in any one direction. The awakening of new spiritual powers brings peace as well as strength, and this also aids in allaying the restlessness of abnormal appetites. A soul at peace with itself is lifted above the slavery of the physical, and the appetite, from being an exacting taskmaster, becomes an obedient servant, as it was made to be. The wife, no less, gains spiritual heights by spiritual procreation. Much of her striving to get for herself and children "what others have" is, no doubt, somewhat an unconscious effect of restlessness from lack of spiritual marriage; for this state of peace belongs, by right, to every wife, and its loss must affect her mental states. It cannot be hers while she sees nothing in the external union but a physical act; but when she is growing in the peace of the spiritual marriage, her newly-created powers are showing her more and more the little comparative value of mere things, and mere position in the world. Taking the externals of marriage,

then, as a means of spiritual growth leads both the husband and the wife to put externalities under their feet.

It is the wife who must lead in this uplifting, for the woman is the guardian of the marriage, and it is her perceptions which can find out its purity, and the way to it. Necessarily, while she believes that it is delicate, pure, and womanly not to care for the physical in marriage,—unknowing of its spiritual value,—she will continue to allow ill-health to come to her from over-fatigue, which would be avoided if she realized the high use in doing so; and the world will go on abounding in invalid wives, and in husbands who live down in the degradation of the mere physical.

The falsity of this notion of "womanly purity" is abundantly proved by facts. If it were true, monasticism and Shakerism would long ago have annihilated the race. Women would have fled to them in crowds, rejoicing in their deliverance from a life of filth. On the contrary, asceticism in marriage, as in everything, has always been a

failure as a mode of living for people in general. Nuns and Shakers are no more than a drop in the great ocean of humanity.

The truth is that there is no time in a woman's adult life when, if she is in love with her husband, she seems to herself so enwrapped in an atmosphere of pure innocence as in her early days of marriage. It extends, also, beyond herself and enfolds all the world. The lovelinesses of nature and of human nature seem more real and deep than she ever recognized before; their uglinesses, more like mere blemishes, capable and almost sure to turn some time toward the beautiful and heavenly. Never before have her own untoward circumstances seemed so certain to work themselves out for good. This innocence, coming in the days when her purity is the most sensitive to outward influences, is a refutation of the theory that marriage has anything in it essentially impure.

The innocence of these first days has a large and peculiar value of its own. It has been supposed to be a mere mood of senti-

mentality. It is exactly the reverse. It is like the innocence of babyhood, which, though not the purity of wisdom, pictures it. These peculiarly innocent states of the baby are images of the innocence which will be reached by growth in general, in spiritual character. Those of the wife and husband in the first days of married life picture the abounding joy and peace they will come into through growth in the true marriage. When the inevitable storms, sometimes terrible with darkness, black with despair, threaten to destroy the happiness of those who marry young and so must work out the first stages of their spiritual growth together, this exquisite purity of the early days may be a beacon light through the otherwise impenetrable clouds. It shines steadily for them, and instead of turning away from it as sentimentality, or an illusion, or a dream, it is to be looked to as lighting the way to the true marriage of their spirits, which cannot be reached except by struggling through darkness and battling with storms.

The two theories stand in dramatic con-

trast. Look at them! for they hold within themselves deep tragedies or endless happiness.

The one seeks the practical annihilation of physical sex.

The other seeks that the power universally acknowledged to be, physically and mentally, the strongest which human beings possess, should consecrate itself to the upward-growing of the race.

ITS SERVICE.

THE sermon, essay and the moral story all tell us that our lives should be a service to fellow-beings, and we intend to make them so. We are kind,—when not too cross; helpful,—when not too busy; unselfish,—when not too much occupied with our own affairs; and in moments of contrition, we scold ourselves for ever being too cross, busy, or self-occupied.

With this sincere purpose at heart, it puzzles and discourages us to find how often our service fails to serve. We sacrifice a longed-for pleasure to insist upon its being enjoyed by some one else, only to discover later that it is what he especially disliked, but had accepted in order to spare our feelings; we overwork to relieve another, and become broken in health, when our nervousness, irritability, and necessary demands upon the strength of friends cause more suffering than all we have relieved; we seek to lighten some

unhappiness by sharing generously our small resources, and find the recipients plunged into deeper gloom, because, from their viewpoint, we have been giving stingily from out our great abundance; we spend time which we crave for self-improvement, in order to minister to one who has no claim upon us, and ever after we are looked upon as a neglectful servant, because we do not make our ministrations life-long; we set aside a larger life which we might have had, in order to bring easier circumstances to a dear one, with the result that we have cleared the way, only, for her to indulge in selfishness ruinous to health, mind, morals and estate; we eagerly engage in philanthropic work, in "education of the masses," and ponder later, as to whether we have done more for this particular "mass" than to sharpen their intellectual tools for making all crimes respectable. Examining our public and our private benefactions, it appears to us that nine-tenths of our "service" has been a giving to some what they did not want, and to the rest what they ought not

to have. Then we sit down in blank despair and wonder what is the matter with the Golden Rule.

The matter is with our reading of it. It does not say

> Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, persist in their accepting it from you, whether they want it or not;

Nor—

> Whatever generosity ye do to others, they will always understand from your view of it, not from theirs;

Nor—

> Whatever foolishness ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.

The Golden Rule, like other spiritual truths, supposedly means discretion, some knowledge of human nature, and common sense,—that is, Wisdom.

In contrast to the thought that these extraneous ministrations are the highest "doing good," we may recall another kind of character. We all have known a few of those rare men and women whose mere presence is a

personal service. It is not that they say and do more interesting things than anybody else, but that they are so interesting in everything they say and do. Their mere "Good morning" is a gift, for it awakens inspiration in us, a sense of having powers ourselves, which they seem tacitly to recognize, and which we have never known we were possessed of. These natures carry with them an influence which one feels as coming from their having found life abundantly worth living. For any one to be admitted into their atmosphere is a rare service which they give, unconsciously, to all who approach them. They do not fail in ordinary offices of kindness, and whatever of philanthropy they think is wise in the present world, where men are striving to make "giving" serve instead of justice; but, more than any conscious "doing for others" is what they do because of what they are. For doing follows upon being as the fruit the flower. The bringing of power into another's life is the only possible real service. The giving of a piece of bread to a hungry boy

is called "doing good"; but if that be all, it is worthless, for it means no more than that he will die of starvation to-morrow, instead of to-day. The real gift would be the putting of power within his reach by which he may find how to get bread for himself, and never hunger again. Further still, that which makes external power of any value is inspiration. One might supply the hungry boy with work, but if he were not roused to feel that he could do it, he would fail. This inspiring of others is the true service. It is the bestowal upon them of the Divine Life constantly flowing through one's character and forth to others. When this Life is kept as free as may be from one's imperfections, it is an inspiration; when vitiated by one's faults, it hinders, or arouses to evil. Those rare souls whose mere presence is a gift, while they mold by their own individuality the Life which they receive, aim to keep it free from their own blemishes. This constant elimination of their evils is their spiritual growing.

Marriage is the condition in which this

growth may be at its full height of conscious happiness. Each class of duties of the husband and the wife are grounds for its activity. The wife may make her homemaking a large and beautiful dwelling-place for her husband by loving its order, neatness, cheerfulness and beauty because it is an atmosphere in which his every power may thrive. She may feel, sensibly, his generous heart grow larger, his noble thought finer, within the genial sunshine of her loving personal care of him. To make room for such deepening of his character, she must constantly put out of life her peculiarities, her petty selfishnesses and her larger evils. Thus the doing of every duty, from the shunning of inner iniquities to the outmost act of making his home restful, may be the means of bringing the Divine Life to her husband's soul. In his turn, he may carry on his business, the foundation of their material existence, with honesty and honorableness, to the end that she may dwell in the peace which integrity brings to a household. His peculiarities and his larger evils

may be avoided so that his manhood shall be a purer home in which her ever-growing womanhood may live and find communion with God. His personal services may be rendered to her with a love that shall continually open her heart wider to all spiritual influences. The entering in of the Divine Life to each through the other will be the deepest joy that human love can know.

In such a marriage, then, each seeks the highest growth attainable, that each may abundantly bestow life upon the other. The husband enfolds the wife in the warm atmosphere of his ever-strengthening manhood, and she responds with sweet appreciation of its character, nourishing it with her woman's wise perception of its possibilities, and thereby growing in her own angelic powers. The spiritual children born of such a marriage are strong, deep-hearted forms of love and wisdom. By these, the home becomes a center from which radiates neighborly love in peculiar strength and beauty. The husband's business is an administering to the

needs and happiness and comfort of the community; the affairs of municipal, national and international interest receive whatever of wise influence it is in the power of such a home to extend to them; while the social life which gathers around is warm with generous interpretation of the neighbor, and deep with aims for loving service in everything it enters into.

There are few such marriages as yet. There cannot be until both men and women understand, each the other, as they do not now. Many husbands and wives who are probably well-mated in interior character are getting on together with only passable comfort. They have not found out that they were made for harmony, for they do not take into account the possibility of adjusting their differences of temperament. One is mild, the other hasty; one is prompt, the other slow. The remedy largely offered in the past has been pious platitudes about "patience," "long-suffering," "never raising one's voice above" (the exact pitch is just now forgotten), "never

answering back," etc., *ad infinitum*. A little common sense would make a better working rule. When a woman, habitually procrastinating, keeps her husband waiting some hours overtime for his noonday dinner,—she having dallied through her shopping trip in a neighboring town, and being her own house-worker,—and he storms about it, and she remarks with habitual slowness and a patient sigh, "Father is *so* impatient," the onlooker feels that a more radical cure for "father" would be the regeneration of "mother's" habits into harmony with the necessities of the masculine stomach. This the dear woman never thinks of; and she goes through life, perhaps, under the rôle of "saint," because of her "patience" with father's temper. This patience is doubly exasperating to his irascibility because everybody implies, and his own conscience tells him, that he is a brute to be angry with a sweet wife who is never angry with him. A closer thought will show that she is as great a sinner as he, indulging, under cover of a naturally mild temper, in a selfishness, un-

conscious, but gigantic, of a natural love of procrastination.

The difficulty widens when the differences are emphasized by sex. A man has never the same outlook as a woman. He sees different things, although he is in the same world and everything is before the sight of both. The boy will stop in the street and watch for hours the digging of a trench, the movement of a car, the hoisting of weights. The girl sees none of these, but gazes enraptured at the textures in shop windows, the exquisite combinations of colors, the grace of the designs. They may not, either of them, have the slightest personal interest in what they are looking at. The girl is merely absorbed in her sensations awakened by delicious coloring and forms, the boy, by strength and power. This difference goes through all the womanhood and manhood of the two. The man refers everything to strength and power, and large, general principles; the woman, to delicacy, grace, and more especial detail. Each recognizes the usefulness in the par-

ticular quality delighted in. The man sees use in strength and knows that the world would "go to pieces" if it were wholly governed by the woman's kind of life; the woman perceives the use in all the finer elements, and that the world would work its own destruction by its very strength if this strength were left unmodified. Each, too, admires the other's quality,—at a distance. Trouble begins when they attempt to join them into one. They admire, but they do not understand; and when the quality of each comes into the life of the other, it annoys, irritates, hurts, displeases, angers. Their struggles are a power for bringing them the discovery that there exists a natural harmony between strength and grace, which, if they will, they may cherish and make grow into an exquisite music in their inner lives. Too often they care more for the lesser things, and so go on uncomfortably in a state of mutual semi-criticism, with little adjustment and no understanding.

The way of cherishing harmony lies in the confidence of each in the quality of the other.

Women are apt to sigh, complainingly, "How queer men are!" and men to mutter, "Just like a woman!" Neither takes the trouble to understand that there is some sense and reason, under the other's view. For instance, a man seldom says, "I am sorry." He repents as often and as truly as a woman, of anger and injustice; but the deeper his repentance, the more insignificant do words seem to him. He resolves that he will show his sorrow by a convincing act; and perhaps at some personal sacrifice to himself, he purchases a gift which he knows his wife has often coveted. This will show her his real sorrow for his fault. He takes it home, eager to be forgiven, and to see the happy smile again. His face is bright with anticipation, and with the tenderness awakened by contrition. To his surprise, pain, and bewilderment, she looks coldly upon the gift, scarcely thanks him for it, and puts it out of sight as soon as she can find excuse for doing so. It is then that, in his chagrin and despair, he mutters, "Just like a woman, you never can please her. I

thought she wanted that more than anything else." On her part, she is saying, heart-brokenly to herself, "How queer men are! He has actually forgotten how unjust he was to me this morning. He looks as happy as if he had never said words to me that I shall never forget. Or, perhaps he thinks he can make up by buying baubles for me. A man will do *anything* rather than to acknowledge himself wrong. It seems as if it would be so easy just to say 'I'm sorry.' It isn't hard for me. I'm *glad* to let him know that I see when I am wrong; but I really believe that William would spend his last cent rather than to own up. Well, he shall know that *my* forgiveness can't be bought. He will have to ask for it if he wants it." So the trouble grows, through weary days, sometimes through the earth-life. The remedy would have been easy at first. If each had had confidence in the other's different kind of sense, they would have said to themselves that the other must mean something that seemed reasonable to him or her. Each would

try to find out how the other is thinking. Then she, on her side, would soon learn of the man's feeling that talking is cheap reparation for a wrong, as if he thought he might indulge in any injustice if he would be willing, afterward, to say a few smooth words; and he, on his, would discover that a sincere word of sorrow for a wrong done her would be more to her than all the jewels of all the crowned heads of Europe.

The struggles come out in a variety of ways, in the necessary, or accepted differences of occupation of the man and the woman. The wife begins to grieve, as the newness of married life wears off, that her husband gradually omits some little attentions which he gave at first. "He does not love me any more, as he did," she says to herself, "he is growing tired of me, as they say all men do of their wives, even the very best of them"; and he, meantime, "Why is she so disturbed because I cannot do everything for her that I did at first? Doesn't she know how hard I work, and as much for her as for myself?

and that I am working to give her a pleasanter home,—yes," and his eyes soften with a loving light, "and one more fitted to her sweet grace?" When the children come, the problem of how to care rightly for them perplexes and absorbs her, and he is often lonely in his home hours. He cannot understand why she should be always with them, and she cannot find any way to help it without neglecting them.

So the differences go on throughout the myriad affairs of the daily round. The young hearts suffer torture from their very love. If they are wise, they soon begin to help each other in adjusting matters, and thus to grow in oneness. The attaining of such understanding cannot be a cold process of the intellect. It is love which makes one wise. There must be the love which yearns to feel, beneath the seemingly cold act, a warmth that makes the action Love's own messenger; or to know why a sincere effort to express sorrow for wrong should be unwelcome; or to understand the necessity for changed habits of the one or the other. The love, also, in

order to feel such yearning, will have needed all modes of making itself felt. This is why the "doctrine of sexlessness" so endangers the growth of marriage oneness. It keeps the husband and wife apart in almost all the wordless forms of mutual understanding. There is small chance for the spirits' nearness when every near approach to each other must be guarded by unnatural restraints, which, under the name of self-control, seek to avoid the expression of love. The knowledge of each other's nature must be superficial, under these restraints, compared with what could be with the same persons, in freer conditions.

Those husbands and wives who come into the beautiful deeper understanding often are of the rare few whose mere presence is a gift to all who enter it. To each other, their lives are a most blessed inspiration. His harshness has been softened by her sensitiveness, her morbidness has grown into a healthy delicateness through the receiving of his strength. His larger interpretation of life, which might easily have run into disorder

for want of limit, is fashioned into beauteous shape by her woman's formative power; her woman's tendency to limit everything to a personal meaning has found larger applications with the aid of his manliness. Their lives bless the world through the highest service of human being to human being,—that of marriage.

THE MARRIAGE OF THE UNMARRIED.

THERE is one principle which obtains throughout the universe, and every action, even the smallest, is the effect of it, as truly as the entire creation. It is the law of union and fruition. The sight of the snow crystals was the fruit of the light uniting with my eye. So every thought, and act, and feeling, as well as all material things, are brought forth by two somethings acting as a one. Below the human plane the unions are temporary, and of either good or bad results. With the human, when they are true, they are marriage, which is always good in its effects. The various human sexual relations not permanent, or not good, are not marriage, although some of them are called so.

The inner personal marriage between husband and wife is that which gives value to the external. Lacking this inner oneness, the

outer tie is mere consecrated externality. In many cases, however, it only seems lacking for a time, and later the real union shows itself as such.

This "oneness" is not possible without another union in each of the two souls. The individual is, in essence, forms of affection and thought, which, when the life is spiritual, act as one. If the ruling affection is bad, delighting in thought false to all true living, it acts itself out into unholy deeds. There is a kind of union between the two, but no real oneness. Evil and falsity are at war, always, even between themselves, and there is no peace to the soul which is governed by them. When the ruling affection is good, it is Love, which continually seeks a marriage with Wisdom, in order to bring forth forms of service to mankind.

The personal real marriage is impossible between a husband and wife who are not, in some degree, each growing in this individual oneness of soul; and the only way to spiritual life for the single man and the single

woman is by the same union of the love and wisdom of their souls, individually.

The fruit of the individual marriage is, like the spiritual children of the husband and wife, service. We are only beginning to know what this word means. In past times it has been applied to all manner of irregular doings, supposed to be beneficial to somebody in proportion to the amount which they destroyed for the doer, of health, strength, time, income, enjoyment, or real usefulness. Its usual name is "sacrifice." It has for ages been supposed to be the road direct to heaven, and this is still insisted on in many sermons, essays, and novels. We are, in spite of this, beginning to know that service is the pouring out upon others of blessings born to our souls through the marriage of love and wisdom in them, and that this marriage takes place, in its fullness, only in the normal round of life. Where "sacrifice" is service, the necessities for it are mere "emergency cases." We render real service by acting out our love in forms of wisdom in the daily living. Where

this is a constant sacrifice, and cannot be made a happy service, something is wrong either with ourselves, which is quite likely, or with the situation, which ought to be changed if possible, and given the most conscientious thought as to how it may be made possible.

Service may be rendered in only a moment's association. You meet a mere acquaintance, exchange a few commonplaces, and go your way refreshed by a something beautiful which has come from his atmosphere into your life. It stays with you. As long as you live, the memory of it inspires you. More deeply still, the chief service which one does is the pouring out of one's life through the wise direction of the daily routine and associations.

Service, to be the child of the inner marriage, necessitates the having of some external work for which one is responsible. Mere desultory duties cannot satisfy a strong affection. One must love steadily, to love deeply; also, wisdom cannot unite with love which wanders from one aim to another. The inner marriage needs a body of permanency, exactly

as the personal marriage needs the same external form. The lack of it is noticeable in the "unmarried" atmosphere of single men and women who have no especial interest in anything of value. They may be even working daily, for the getting of an income, but they put into their tasks no more than an external wisdom. This is not marriage. Different, entirely, is the atmosphere of single men who carry on their business with wise devotion, in honesty, honorableness, and conscious or unconscious love of service. Vastly different, too, is that of single women who, perhaps in their own work, perhaps only as a subordinate in another's, are earnestly uniting their devotion (love) to good judgment (wisdom). These single men and women have a roundness and a fullness of mentality indicating marriage, which, indeed, they are growing into, and are giving of its service to the world. The others bear an atmosphere in which something is wanting, and that something is essential. It may be useful to recall here, that there are husbands and wives who have

the same "unmarried" appearance, and it is reasonable to judge that it is caused by their not having grown, to any great extent, in the individual union.

The inner marriage cannot exist, to any satisfactory degree, unless the service is real. A woman may plan, systematically, to spend her life making sofa pillows, embroidering her gowns, and putting ornaments on the dress of her sister's children, interspersing these "domestic duties" with pincushions and dolls for fairs, and all this may be of little service. If the sofa pillows and embroidery are merely "something to do" they are not useful, and no wisdom can join itself to such a love. As for fairs, they are simply an extravagant means for people to cheat themselves into paying more money toward a cause than their judgment would otherwise allow. There is almost no service in such work, and women who devote their lives to it are missing much of the marriage which belongs to them.

On the other hand, a man or a woman may have a position in which he or she seems to

do no real work, but only to cultivate the mind, and yet may be filling an important place in the world's uses. Suppose a father, left by his wife's death with a motherless girl. Being yet in her teens, she is not old enough to assume the household cares, and there is a tried and faithful upper servant who does this with entire satisfaction. The father feels the need of the protection and companionship for his daughter, of a woman who is her social equal. He has a relative who gladly accepts his invitation to make her home with them for this purpose. One might say, judging casually, that this older woman led an idle life. Yet, being a true woman, she is employed in real service. She interests herself, as she must always have done, in all good thought, and all good doings of the world. She considers that it is her especial work, now, to provide an atmosphere of rich mentality for the young girl. She has no authority over the younger one. Nevertheless, by her own character, broad, deep, and true, she opens to the other's vision the possibilities of a fine

womanhood. If the girl is one capable of vision, so that she can be inspired, the other's service to her is all the more real that it is unconscious in detail, and without authority. It is a fine service, because the one who gives it is fine herself. It is so well worth working for, the real character-growth. In any situation, it is an inspiration to the character of others. It is so free from self-conceit, so absolutely without self-consciousness, because it is continually seeking the marriage within itself of the highest love and the deepest wisdom it can learn of.

Cases like the above, where a woman has a real work to do without an apparent outer form, are rare. Usually, service takes a definite shape, and one in which success measures its efficiency. This is the normal life. Success is a legitimate element of the individual marriage. Whether the success is really the child of that marriage depends, as does failure, and everything else, upon what we do with it. Some people have a genius for succeeding, as others have for art, music,

or science. By these, the interior marriage cannot be gained except by loving their success for the service it renders, instead of for its selfish gain. To those who have not an external genius for it, the failures may point out the way to get it, and this can be for them only by means of the union of the love and wisdom of the soul. The spirituality of failure has been often insisted upon, and with truth, except that, usually, only the half is told. Failure is spiritual as far as it points out how to unite love with wisdom, and so finally to bring success. For the ultimate of spirituality is common sense, and "all power is in ultimates." It is not sensible to suppose that the object of spiritual service is not to do the service. One's worldly gains may not be very great, but that some degree of external success will follow any work loved so deeply that it seeks, until it finds, forms of wisdom through which to act, is simply to say that God works through His own laws. Failure is usually caused by one of two conditions (the failure which is brought upon a

person in business by the errors of other people is not here meant):—Either we have chosen the wrong work, or we have not used the wisdom necessary to make the right one efficient. In one case or the other, we are not marrying our love to our wisdom. Instead of being discouraged by the failure, we might rejoice that it is trying to point out to us the way to the true service, *i. e.*, success.

Health, that much despised and much abused element of our lives, is an essential to the fullness of the inner marriage. In wedlock, the wife may attain to heights of spiritual wifehood and motherhood, when in health, which the same woman could never dream of in invalidism. Similarly, the single man or the single woman, needs to preserve health as earnestly, for the sake of the interior marriage. The service of both soul and body rests upon control of one's own powers, and this can be gained fully only in their normal condition. We have inherited from an ancestry beridden with asceticism, the notion that invalidism is a synonym for godliness.

Consequently, not one in a thousand of us is well and strong. We have dropped the idea of the actual godliness, but we have not yet taken into recognition the unspirituality of illness. We are not responsible for our invalidism in its beginning, any more than we are for a naturally irritable temper; but neither is the want of health more spiritual than the temper. Evils can be utilized for teaching us humility and patience. Nevertheless, a spiritually-minded person does not go on in courses which he knows will increase his violent temper on the theory that it is a means of regeneration. The same principle ought to be carried out in invalidism, as in any other evil. We cannot help, always, having come into ill-health. This often is upon us before we have learned how we might avoid it. When this is the case, we can work as faithfully toward its alleviation or its cure, as we do to control and lessen irritability, obstinacy, unkind feeling, or any other fault. As a means of discipline, the keeping of one's health far outstrips the power

of sickness. More actual self-denial is needed to guard the health, than for overworking, over-eating, under-exercising, under-sleeping, over-recreating, and overdoing "doing good to others" until we fall sick. Ill-health often comes from the selfishness of want of self-control, or from timidity, which dares not resist unjust demands from others upon one's time and strength, or income. Self-indulgence and timidity have nothing spiritual in them.

Ill-health is unspiritual, because it prevents the completeness of the inner marriage. Except in "emergency cases," which are rare unless we manufacture them artificially, no love that we can pour out upon another while weakening our own powers in order to do it, can compare, in stimulating life to the receiver, with what we do by love united to wisdom in normal physical energy and vigor.

Much of the loneliness and forlornness of single life would disappear with the adoption of the conscious aim to grow in the inner marriage. Single persons who desire the personal marriage, ascribe an undue amount of

loneliness to the lack of the domestic companionship they long for. It is the inner marriage which drives away loneliness, the loving to do real service in the world. Without this, the married woman is as much a prey as the unmarried to mental miseries. If she does not feel alone, she is wretched because she does not, for she is overburdened with the demands of the human beings whose happiness and comfort she must care for. Nothing but love of service can make the numberless duties of the wife and mother seem anything but weights depriving her of mental growth, their conflicting elements anything but vexations. Exactly as the burdens of the married are turned into loving responsibilities, the perplexities into interesting problems, by the inner marriage in the individual soul of the husband and of the wife, so is the loneliness of the unmarried turned into mental freedom for becoming wisely loving in human service, by the same marriage in the soul. To single men and women who long for their own domestic life and interests,

the inner marriage makes greater the possibility of the coming of the outer. The thought of service in one's mind drives away the shyness in association with the other sex, which causes many a sweet woman and noble man to appear cold and indifferent. The true spiritual state would guard a woman from sentimentality (the selfishness of vanity) on the one hand, and from unwomanly boldness on the other. Frank, wholesome intercourse with friends of the other sex, which is the soundest foundation for marriage love, would become a habit. When the personal marriage is finally given to such a man and such a woman, they have not lost anything by the lateness in its coming. For, just as husband and wife, married young, have found their closer union by growth into the individual marriage through the experiences of life together, so will the others, during the time of waiting, have reached this same marriage, which has been fitting their souls for becoming one.

MARRIAGE LAWS.

MARRIAGE laws would be extremely simple if marriages were always happy. It is its unhappy relations which make the need of elaborate regulations about it.

The variety of its laws, both in Church and State, causes great uneasiness to the conscience of the public, or else to its sense of fitness. Divorce and remarriage are the mooted issues. The State, in general, allows both; the Church, —the Protestant,—inclines to frown them down, although only one denomination prohibits them. The consensus of State opinion is that every person has a right to marriage, and that if the present one is given up he may be allowed another; the Church implies that God hath joined together whomsoever the priest hath pronounced husband and wife, and that the breaking of this union is a violation of the marriage sanctity. The many States of our Union, and the many sects of

the church, differ greatly in their modes of expressing their general principles.

The majority of persons have an opinion as to a wise and uniform code. A few have none. It is clear to them that no change for the better can be made with only the present kind of knowledge on the subject. Marriage principles are not studied by the general mind of even the cultivated world. The subject itself, as serious philosophy, is a forbidden one in conversation and in literary essay. Marriage holds in its power the spiritual, moral, mental, and physical welfare, and even the actual continuance of the race, but its nature and needs are not given as much thought as the life of a dog, or the habits of a pet rabbit. With a few honorable exceptions, the controversies about it have concerned principally its outer form. They have not touched its inner nature, the terms of outer life best fitted to the character-growth of the individuals united in it, the danger to that growth, of careless laxity regarding divorce; or, on the other hand, of holding bound together a man

and a woman entirely unsuited to each other; or, of keeping from remarriage some pre-eminently fitted for strengthening by it the character-growth of the race; and thus through individual inferiority, the debasing of race integrity. The world looks upon marriage, now, as it has for ages, as inherently a self-indulgence, sanctified only by a religious rite. Such sanctification, which is supposed to be "the institution of marriage," when it has once covered over the grossness of the self-indulgence, must be guarded, because it is the only thing about the union which is supposed to be sacred.

Therefore, marriage cannot be talked of seriously. Fiction, to be sure, is allowed and encouraged to entertain and horrify with pictures of marriage violations, its miseries and the crimes committed in its name. These miseries and crimes, also, make the kernel of one half the jokes in life and literature; but serious converse upon normal marriage is not good form in good society. How can it be, when the common, even cultivated,

thought makes it a mere glossing over of the grossest self-indulgence, physically, and of an equally gross self-devoted self-happiness, mentally? An attempt at a higher stand is sometimes made in the excuse for the reticence, —that marriage is too "sacred" to be talked about. This would have a semblance of reason if it were too sacred to be joked about. It even then would be not more than a semblance. For marriage, as the strongest human power for the finest character-building, is not a kind of sacredness which cannot be talked about. Personal experiences, which are what the excuse refers to, are not principles of marriage any more than personal habits are principles of neatness. The establishing, in the general mind, of marriage as the great principle of life, is the only foundation for laws about it which shall be universal and lasting.

It is not forgotten that, in the past, there have been sundry volumes of "Advice to Wives," and an occasional one of "Advice to Husbands," and that ministers speak of

marriage as sacred; but the "Advices," when summed up, are only commonplaces about being amiable, and the ministers' remarks, often equally commonplace, are taken by everybody as what ought to be said in church. They are all looked upon as pious sayings expected in such connections. Marriage continues to be held as a not proper topic for serious consideration in good society.

The life of marriage depends upon two conditions,—*permanency, and inner union.* Real marriage is a constant growth in spiritual oneness, and temporariness cannot promote it. To the husband and wife who love their marriage with each other, the finding out how they may make a mutual adjustment of their natures is their greatest joy. No blemish in the other brings discouragement to either; no self-gratification can compare with the delight of yielding individual preferences in order to increase the growing oneness. Sacrifice ceases to be sacrifice, for all is service,—the greatest human joy. The unselfish service and joy begin in feebleness, but steadily

gain strength. All this necessitates permanency, the body of marriage.

Its soul is inner union. Fortunately for humanity, although it complicates the problem, marriage has a soul. It cannot be formed with any two, one man and one woman, however earnest and honest each may be. The two must be so fitted for each other that each may be able to see through surface imperfections and even grave evils of the other, to the spark from the Divine Life at the center of the soul. Otherwise, there is always the danger that their characters will clash and destroy each other. The difficulty in making adequate laws lies in this need of marriage for its own soul. When this is wanting, something ought to be done, and it is for this reason that study is necessary.

The possibility of inner union is not always lacking where it seems to be. There are temporary unhappinesses, serious for a time, but gradually disappearing with experience and growth. Without permanence, these husbands and wives would miss the final joy of their

real marriage. With characters well-mated, where there is the feeblest desire for other than a wholly selfish life, the chance always remains for happiness.

Outside of these are found many unions which are only legal arrangements. Some of them are between men and women too ignorant or too selfish, or both, to enter into anything deeper. Such joinings of the mere outer life are as common in cultivated society as in the slums. Another class, needing the wisest laws, are the mismated husband and wife who are both earnest characters, capable of a true marriage; but who have made an honest mistake in choice, and their daily living together is a deadening of their highest growth.

Every true marriage is an incalculable power constantly on the increase, for the upward growth of the world. The spiritual effects of any life are like seeds, each producing other seeds, and each of these progenitors of countless millions more. The life of a true marriage is such seed, of the supremest quality.

It is made up of all the best of the man and all the best of the woman, with an ever-increasing elimination of their evils. It thus works, constantly, for the creating of a stronger and finer human race. The world cannot afford to lose anything of such character. The story is told of Lincoln, to whom an officer reported that a young Quaker, who had been conscripted, would not fight and did not fear either punishment or death. Should they shoot him for a traitor? "No," answered the great President, "don't you see the country can't afford to lose a man like that for nothing? Find some reason for sending him home." There may be a doubt of the fact of a Quaker being forced into the army in this country, but the story has a deep truth in it. The race cannot afford to destroy its strongest and finest fiber, nor can it any more afford to prevent its growth. Yet it does this every time it hinders a real marriage. The yielding, meekly, of the victims, to such hindrances is much advocated in real life, and prominently in fiction, with the claim that it is the

highest nobility of character. The keeping of a promise of marriage when one or the other finds the choice a mistake has been considered earthly angelhood. Sacrificing one's marriage to the countless selfishnesses of relatives is another deification of what is, in reality, a sin against humanity, except in the intention of the victim who does it. Also, those marriage laws which prevent true marriages are a form of destruction of the finest strength of the race. Marriage cannot be kept a sacred institution unless as a builder of character it is not only preserved, but planted, watered, and cherished in its growth.

How shall we guard marriage as the grandest human character? How shall we get for the world the maximum of such character, at present, and work toward its constant increase? How shall we bring to bear upon every marriageable person the strongest influence for leading him to look toward his possible marriage as an entity having both soul and body? What is the knowledge which will enable the husband and wife, newly wedded, to live

toward making their marriage a constantly increasing soul within its body, by seeking between themselves a constantly growing oneness? What is the knowledge which will lead the temporarily unhappy in their union to find the harmony possible to them? What kind of knowledge will guide to a decision as to the wisest law for the actually mismated, whose efforts to become the married "one" only fashion them into individualities less and less suited for welding into such oneness? Those are meant here who began with the honest belief that they were mentally fitted to one another, and who are sincerely living as truly as they know how. They are like a heart and hand which, the more perfect they grow, the heart as heart, and the hand as hand, are less and less able to act together, as the heart can with the lungs, and the hand with its mate. Or, they are like a horse and an elephant, yoked together. These are both noble animals, but unfitted for union. The more perfect the horse as a horse, and the elephant as an elephant, the more readily will

they destroy each other's highest powers, if bound into the same harness. Finally, How shall the world so emphasize the supreme pricelessness for itself of the marriage-character that the tendency will be to turn those toward it who care nothing for its outer body, and know nothing of its inner soul?

If it is true, as is here assumed, that marriage-character is the integrity of the race, definite philosophic study, at stated times, is not, by any means, all the kind of thought it needs. As much, it is imperative that in any touch upon marriage in common conversation, we should invariably speak *from* its principles. Talking *of* principles is not useful in ordinary chit-chat; but it is our obligation to an earnest life to talk always *from* them. This would throw out all joking about the unhappiness of marriage. Also all the light conversation would be shunned about weddings, as if clothes, furniture, and the husband's income, actual and possible, were the aim of the marriage; but it would make these very things of interest as signs

of outer forms which shall contain the marriage purity and its service.

There are ideas, always brought up in the discussion of marriage laws, which are commonly treated with an abundance of thought that does not reach far below the surface. The rigorist theory of divorce is one. This has, for centuries, been practiced by the Roman Church, the oldest and largest Christian denomination in the world. Its record, that, with the exception of Ireland, the Catholic countries are distinguished for an immorality forming the life of a majority of their peoples, high and low, leaves no need for further research into the theory.

A Protestant modification of this law is,—Divorce, but no remarriage. Sensible persons favor this decree, yet it is among those man-made laws which have no common sense for their foundation. This alone, taking no other proof, shows the dearth of thought upon marriage as character-building, and is an evidence of the attempt to uphold the institution artificially. One moment's consideration

will show its utter unreason. The divorced person is bound to a dead contract, as one Siamese twin, living, to his dead brother; bound to a bond which does not bind, to an obligation without duties or responsibilities, except not to do something which the former husband or wife has no longer any right to care for, whether it is done or not. What kind of a ghastly thing is this for sensible humanity to torture itself with,—to stunt and cripple and deaden the life remaining to some of its members, and consequently to its own as a whole? The measure is supposed to be a preventive of divorce. This is trying to prevent an evil by after penalty, rather than by previous instruction, a method which has always failed and is always failing. The Protestant Church, as a whole, has never lifted its voice in teaching that marriage is the highest form of character-building. This knowledge would be the greatest power in preventing legal unions which need divorce. The Church stands for motherhood. She has no moral right to refuse to help her children

to make up for mistakes which she has not had the moral force to show them how to keep out of. She may claim that right, but not as a mother; it has much resemblance to the edict of a tyrant. There are many kinds of mothers, and some of them are tyrants. The Church is supposed to be worthy of the name. The true mother teaches her child, helps him in his errors, shows him how to make his failures steps to higher living. She does not cut him off from the chances of that higher living. Especially, she does not give him penalties for mistakes made in ignorance of what she has not known how to teach him. She goes to work, late as it is, with the aim of remedying the evil by instruction, if she now knows; by seeking it, if she does not yet know. She sees that she enfeebles the family life by holding him back from his highest growth, not less after his mistake than before. The Church, likewise, weakens the institution of marriage, and her own spiritual character, when she holds back any of her children from any possibilities for their highest growing.

Often it is said that the prohibition of divorce, or of remarriage after, is not injurious to the individual, because all suffering is regenerative. All needful suffering is regenerative, like the pain which comes to the injured limb, reviving into health. Unneedful suffering is the torture which leads to death.

Also, they say, that by this theory are sacrificed only the few for the good of the many. This, too, is untenable. A hand cannot be maimed, a leg crippled, or a heart diseased without a weakening of the whole body. Neither can the character-growth of any person be obstructed without enfeebling the fiber of the great humanity.

Again, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." This most sacred truth has been much profaned, by practically reversing it,—What man has joined together, let not even God put asunder. God has had nothing to do with some marriage ceremonies except to permit them, as He does other evils. They have been conceived in iniquity, shapen in sin, and presided over by the Prince of

Darkness, to whom the priest has lent his services, simply because he must, having had no power to refuse, or interfere. It is not necessary that either he or we should declare that every marriage ceremony performed by him is the work of God. No one can doubt that such unions often take place, and that they sometimes result, through the very suffering they cause, in turning one or the other of the pair in horror from their sin, and toward a longing for a real marriage, as in the case of Gwendolen, in *Daniel Deronda;* the other goes on living down in the depths, thus crippling the life of the one. This shows the need of research into the nature of spiritual adultery.

For adultery is the only ground of divorce admitted by the Bible. Every avowed Christian acknowledges a glad homage to the Bible as the absolute truth. Only a few, perhaps none, in these days of spiritual awakening, hold that all its truth dwells in its literal statements. Every person who believes the "graven images" we must not worship to be, besides material things, or

the inordinate longing for them, even the worship of one's intellect, or one's culture, or other mentalities; that the "killing" we are not to do is, besides the taking of physical life, or the desire to take it, any hatred of the neighbor; that the "stealing" forbidden is not alone the taking of his goods, or even the desire to take them, but also the depriving the neighbor of happiness, or anything else pertaining to his welfare,—every person believing these interpretations is not standing on ground where he can insist that "adultery" means the outer sin alone, or even the mental longing to commit it. Spiritual adultery is the adulterating of good and the falsifying of truth. It may be committed in one's own character, alone; it follows that it may be effected by a husband and wife upon each other's characters. A husband who holds his wife down to base living, preventing her growth in the possibilities within her, by choking up the way with his own foulness, must be adulterating the good of her character; and when he turns the truth he knows into

falsity, and keeps her, by her necessity of living in his life, from finding out the true interpretations, he must be adulterating her truth, and, consequently, the good which belongs to it. Further than this, adultery is the union of two who do not belong to each other. It then must be the mental condition of two persons mismated in marriage, even when they are both honest and earnest. The husband may be, for instance, social in nature, and the wife of a more serious genius. He feels that love to the neighbor means hospitality, a generous giving of one's best, a living in one's good things for the sake of such sharing. Consequently, he loves much social life of the home; and that there may be room and service for such hospitality, he loves as large a house and as many servants as he can afford. With all this, being human, he is imperfect, and his faults naturally take the form of pride in his beautiful living and his hospitality. He is aware of this evil, but he believes that it is the pride which he should strive to lay aside, not the hospitality. His wife is so

unlike him, that she cannot even understand him. She loves serious thought. Social life is mostly worldliness to her. She believes that one must shun its outer forms in order to shun the worldliness itself. She engages, perhaps, in class work, studying much herself and helping others to learn to think. She finds her social pleasures in these connections. It seems to her a sinful waste of life to spend money and time on supplying people with things to eat, beds to sleep in, and mere chit-chat for entertainment. The pride of her husband in doing these things seems to her his realest self, his love of the neighbor in them not much more than a self-made excuse for the pride. To overcome the evil, she would have him give up the hospitality. On the other side she is just enough to know that she has no right to insist upon his doing this, simply because it is her way, and therefore she wastes much of her life, as she believes, in joining in, and carrying on her part of, his hospitality. There is a continual warfare in her soul over the question whether

she is not helping him in error, instead of simply yielding him wifely consideration. If there are children, her sense of wronging them by uniting with him in his course is terrible. The battle in his soul is no less fierce. In justice to her he omits many forms of neighborly kindliness, that she may not be disturbed in the life which she considers of value. To him, though, it seems a self-righteousness to be always trying to teach somebody something. He is right, for she, not being perfect, has this kind of pride,—it belongs to her kind of nature. She is struggling against it, but his very evident opinion of it, although he tries to conceal it, magnifies his worldliness so largely in her eyes, that it hides from her the real greatness of her own self-righteousness. She, in her turn, tries to conceal her opinion from his sight, and they succeed in keeping up an outward harmony. Each is, within, neither himself (herself) nor the other. Each is trying in vain to make a union between his or her good and her or his truth, and they do not belong to each

other. The service to others which she loves expresses itself through thought. She sees that the evils of the world, large and small, come from thoughtlessness. If people would only think what they are doing, they would not injure each other by private selfishness and public wrongs. Lack of thought is, as she sees it, the great crime of the world. To him, the world's sins come from lack of love, from selfishness. People preach, and study and think and then bring to the family associations moodiness, unpleasant words, unjust interpretations of each other. Their thinking powers often work to save money for comforts for themselves which they never share with anybody; to carry on their business as a device for getting much and giving little, or they often bury themselves in a selfish love of study. It is *love* people need, he says, and they will never think themselves into it; they must *feel* themselves into it, and then thoughts enough will come. Thus, with the best efforts possible the husband and wife adulterate each other's good and falsify their

truths. They strive to be just, to leave each other in freedom, and the yielding makes a less loving man of him, but with a growing tendency to undervalue thought, and a less sincerely thoughtful woman of her, although with a growing tendency to undervalue love as a direct motive. Love and thought are both vitiated in both characters. They are not a help to each other. In order that a wife's influence should tend to lead a husband out of his faults, she must understand the good underneath, she cannot help him by merely combatting his evils. Likewise, he with her.

The disquietness of mind grows into a distaste for each other's ways. The pose of her head, the motion of her hand, suggests to him disagreeably her self-righteousness. The air with which he passes her a glass of water is to her a sign that he cherishes worldliness in his smallest act. Thus, they destroy each other's best by preventing its growth. The children, the most sensitive of mortals to the spiritual states of others, soon learn, in spite

of the conscientious efforts of father and mother to hide it, that harmony is merely on the outside. Each takes sides, unconsciously, with whichever parent suits him best, finding excuse for his own evils in the one or the other; and learns, besides, his little lesson of how life may be made a mere appearance of what it is not. The family life in spirit, is a warfare of mutually destroying elements of character.

This is an instance of one of the very mildest kinds of hells of spiritual adultery. Yet men and women, thoughtful on every other subject, advocate with eagerness the perpetuation of these hells, holding such nominal husbands and wives in lives of sinning, and ruining the innocence, for all the earth-life, of little children. They do this, not because of a desire to injure humankind, but in the hope of stamping out the evil of divorces for insufficient causes. That is, they are trying to destroy a natural monster by creating an artificial one to kill him off. This is a non-uplifting and *never succeeding* process. The

problem to be worked out is,—How shall the Law provide so that the danger on both sides shall be brought down, absolutely, to its minimum? If it encourages separation during temporary misunderstandings of any two who might grow into one by longer patience and a deeper effort, the character-growth of all humanity is vitiated by loss of this true marriage; and none the less, if the two grow more unlike with their increase of perfection of individual development, an equal vitiation of race-character takes place. Hasty dicta will not destroy the double-headed evil. On one side the arbitrary holding of two characters together who never can grow into one, violates the imperative demand of marriage for its own soul, the inner union; on the other, the changing of one's husband or one's wife with every changing mood, is equally destructive of the permanence imperative to the growing inner oneness. The Law must be impelled by love of the highest race-life possible to be attained, and must be framed by wise perception of what will lead the race to such life. That is,—The

Law, to be effective, must mean "marriage," through and through. It must be, itself, a marriage of race love and wisdom. It must have for its purpose that other marriage,—the ever-increasing-oneness of Permanence and Inner union.

---

*Does the above mean lawlessness, loose morals and free-love? It means nothing of the kind. It is a statement of unfortunate conditions which are,—of fortunate conditions which should be,—and of the spiritual truth connected with them. It is a query as to how this truth may be applied to the conditions which are, so that they may be turned into those which should be. It appeals to human beings to interest themselves in Marriage, the Reality, and to abolish the masked hideousness, Imitation. It is a hint that present Laws, the rigid and the lenient, concern themselves with the wrong element in the matter; that bringing

*This part is added in the second edition. J. D. M.

to the world a maximum of genuine Marriage will never be accomplished by Church or State with Laws as to who may or may not unmarry. It suggests that genuine Marriage will be generated and cherished through the enforcement by the State, and the giving by the Church, of Education in those common Marriage principles of which the ignorant, even, may be taught a sufficient little, and the intelligent, a satisfying much; also, that genuine Marriage will be fostered by a code of Laws for, not the absolute prevention of divorce, but for the prevention of the wrong divorces, by means of a time of probation required of each applicant, during which the quality of the present union shall be put to thorough test; these Laws to be framed and carried out by Boards of Marriage, which every State shall have, as it has now its Boards of Health, and shall require every Church to have for the instruction and guidance of its members.

To repeat, that all who care to, may understand without mistake:—

Free-love can never lead to Marriage. Free-

love seeks, rather than avoids, wandering; while Marriage lives toward the growing oneness which necessitates permanence. The only preparation for the genuine Marriage is Education in its principles, and this is what the normal Laws will treat of when normal Laws are made. The majority of the unhappy marriages are so, not because they are mistakes, but because those in them do not know the need or methods for finding the growing oneness. With those marriages turned toward the true purpose, the small minority of men and women who are in mismated unions will safely be allowed divorce and remarriage, if they desire, without endangering the general welfare, and indeed, to its eternal betterment.

But, Education is such a lengthy process? No! The long road is, Ignorance.

HQ 45
M551 2
1906

Es nit